Mass-Varying Neutrinos from a Variable Cosmological Constant

R. Horvat*

Rudjer Bošković Institute, P.O.B. 180, 10002 Zagreb, Croatia

arXiv:astro-ph/0505507v2 2 Jan 2006

Abstract

We consider, in a completely model-independent way, the transfer of energy between the components of the dark energy sector consisting of the cosmological constant (CC) and that of relic neutrinos. We show that such a cosmological setup may promote neutrinos to mass-varying particles, thus resembling a recently proposed scenario of Fardon, Nelson, and Weiner (FNW), but now without introducing any acceleronlike scalar fields. Although a formal similarity of the FNW scenario with the variable CC one can be easily established, one nevertheless finds different laws for neutrino mass variation in each scenario. We show that as long as the neutrino number density dilutes canonically, only a very slow variation of the neutrino mass is possible. For neutrino masses to vary significantly (as in the FNW scenario), a considerable deviation from the canonical dilution of the neutrino number density is also needed. We note that the present 'coincidence' between the dark energy density and the neutrino energy density can be obtained in our scenario even for static neutrino masses.

* horvat@lei3.irb.hr

It is today firmly established experimentally that neutrinos have nonzero masses and nontrivial mixings, thus pointing to the existence of physics beyond the standard model. In addition, relic neutrinos in the universe, being the second most abundant particles in the universe, also play an important role in measuring neutrino mass with cosmological data, in setting bounds on nonstandard neutrino properties, and also in solving some of the cosmological problems.

Another great discovery in recent years has been an observation of the accelerating rate of expansion of the universe, usually attributed to some mysterious dark energy sector. The existence of the dark energy sector, however, constitutes an immediate problem in the form of today's coincidences [1] towards the rest of the components in the universe: dark matter, ordinary matter, radiation, and neutrinos. From the known behavior of the first three components since big bang nucleosynthesis (BBN), one finds that any reasonable tracking of these components by dark energy always goes at the expense of the late time transition of its equation of state, thus creating a new problem called the "why now?" problem. The recent idea proposed by Fardon, Nelson and Weiner (FNW) [2] and developed later by Kaplan, Nelson, and Weiner [3], and Peccei [4] was to circumvent these problems for relic neutrinos (because the cosmological behavior of their energy density is much less known), by tying together their sector with that of dark energy, in such a way that dark energy always diluted at the same rate as the neutrino fluid. This was possible if the mass of the neutrino was promoted to a dynamical quantity, being a function of the acceleron field (canonically normalized scalar field similar to quintessence [5]). The main feature of the scenario [2] is that although the number density of neutrinos dilutes canonically ($\sim a^{-3}$), the masses of neutrinos change almost inversely ($\sim a^{-3\omega}$), thereby promoting their energy density to an almost undilutable substance. Hence relic neutrinos become tightly coupled to the original dark energy fluid. If this can be kept for most of the history of the universe, the near coincidence at present, $\rho_\Lambda \sim \rho_\nu$, will cease to be perceptive as a coincidence at all.

For models with variable mass neutrinos prior to the proposal [2] see [6], and for those who discussed neutrino mass in connection with dark energy, see [7]. Application of the FNW proposal includes some studies on leptogenesis [8], solar neutrinos [9], and also on the cosmo MSW effect [10].

In the present paper we show how the variable but "true" cosmological constant (CC), with the equation of state (EOS) $\omega_\Lambda \equiv p_\Lambda/\rho_\Lambda$ being precisely -1, may give rise to scale-

dependent neutrino masses, in the absence of any acceleronlike scalar fields. Throughout the paper we always highlight those points in which our scenario differs from the FNW one. Models with the variable CC which could successfully mimic quintessence models and may also shed some light on the coincidence problem (between dark energy and dark matter), have been put forward recently. Especially relevant are found those models where the CC-variation law was inferred from some underlying physical theory: like particle physics theory [11, 12], quantum gravity [13], or gravitational holography [14]. A review of phenomenological CC-variation laws considered before the discovery of dark energy, can be found in [15]. The essential features of the cosmological evolution in variable CC cosmologies were summarized in [16].

The continuous transfer of energy between the CC and the gas of relic neutrinos (and *vice versa*, depending on the sign of the interaction term) can be conveniently modeled by the generalized equation of continuity[1]

$$\dot{\rho}_\Lambda + \dot{\rho}_\nu + 3H\rho_\nu(1+\omega_\nu) = 0 \,, \tag{1}$$

where overdots denote time derivatives. The phase space distribution of relic neutrinos is predicted to be given by the homogeneous and isotropic Fermi-Dirac distribution of the type

$$f_\nu(p) = \frac{1}{\exp\left[\frac{(p^2+m_\nu^{'2})^{1/2}-\mu_\nu}{T}\right]+1} \,, \tag{2}$$

with $\mu_\nu \to -\mu_\nu$ for antineutrinos. Notice that (2) is not an exact equilibrium distribution because $m_\nu^{'} \equiv m_\nu a_{dec}/a$, where a_{dec} denotes the scale factor at the time of decoupling t_{dec}. If neutrinos are relativistic at decoupling ($m_\nu \ll T_{dec}$), notice that f_ν still retains its relativistic form even for $T \ll m_\nu$, because it is $m_\nu^{'}$ ($m_\nu^{'} \ll T$) and not m_ν that appears in (2). In addition, large neutrino mixing revealed in neutrino oscillation experiments may serve to conclude that chemical potentials for all neutrinos should be small [17]. Hence, $m_\nu^{'}$ and μ_ν in (2), along with the EOS ω_ν for nonrelativistic neutrinos in (1), can be safely disregarded for all practical purposes.

We see from (1) that the CC all the time decays to neutrinos (or *vice versa*), meaning that the energy density of relic neutrinos, $m_\nu n_\nu$, no longer scales canonically $\sim a^{-3}$. Here we

[1] For the sake of simplicity, we restrict ourselves here to the case of one neutrino family as in [2]; the generalization to three families of neutrinos is straightforward.

make a specific *anzatz* for the energy transfer between the two components coupled through (1), which leaves the number density of neutrinos to dilute canonically, but promotes the mass of the neutrino to a running quantity, that is,

$$m_\nu(a) = m_{\nu_0} a^\alpha; \qquad n_\nu(a) = n_{\nu_0} a^{-3} \,, \tag{3}$$

where α is a constant, the subscript '0' denotes the present-day values and the present value for the scale factor is set to 1. With the *anzatz* (3) in (1), one immediately arrives at

$$n_\nu + \frac{\partial \rho_\Lambda}{\partial m_\nu} = 0 \,, \tag{4}$$

which is nothing but the assumption of stationarity of ρ_{dark} under changes in m_ν from the FNW scenario [2]. We thus find that, in one aspect, the FNW scenario is equivalent to the variable CC scenario.[2] Notice further that when the interaction phrased by (1) is quenched, *i. e.*, when $\alpha \to 0$, the *anzatz* (3) still keeps neutrino masses nonzero. It is thus implicitly implied that there exists at least one extra mechanism (besides that from the CC) for generation of the neutrino mass. This is not so with the FNW proposal, and it is just this feature which is shown below to be crucial in determining the law $m_\nu(a)$.

Using the *anzatz* (3) it is easy to obtain a solution for ρ_Λ in the form

$$\rho_\Lambda(a) = \frac{\alpha}{3-\alpha}\rho_\nu(a) + \rho_\Lambda^C \,, \tag{5}$$

where ρ_ν (and also ρ_Λ) now scales as $\sim a^{-3+\alpha}$. The integration constant ρ_Λ^C is the IR limit of the CC and represents the true ground state of the vacuum. Regarding Eq. (5), several comments are in order. If $\alpha > 0$, we are in the realm of decaying CC cosmologies ($\dot{\rho}_\Lambda < 0$), whereas $\alpha < 0$ means that the transfer of energy is from neutrinos to the CC ($\dot{\rho}_\Lambda > 0$). Since the cosmic matter budget today consists of no more than 5% of massive neutrinos [18], one concludes for the $\alpha > 0$ case that ρ_Λ^C should always be nonzero (and positive), unless α is fine-tuned to be very close to 3 (such large values of α are yet excluded, see below). On the other hand, for $\alpha < 0$, the first term in (5) is negative, and hence also the large and positive ρ_Λ^C is required. These considerations automatically show that the CC-variation law

[2] The same conclusion was obtained in [4] but from considerations which demanded to move away from the nonrelativistic limit. Here we show that the stationarity condition for nonrelativistic neutrinos (4) is a trivial consequence of the continuity relation (1), as long as the number density of neutrinos scales canonically.

obtained from gravitational holography [14] is not able to underpin the present scenario as there ρ_Λ^C always vanishes. In addition, we have assumed that dark matter and neutrinos are tightly coupled but also that there is no interaction between dark energy and baryons (or other components), which means that the Equivalence Principle is violated. Since the interaction between dark energy and neutrinos is controlled by the parameter α, it is also a measure of violation of the Equivalence Principle. Next, we adapt the framework of the effective EOS for the variable CC term (5), in order to obtain the law $m_\nu(a)$.

The effective EOS for the variable CC whose interaction is phrased by (1) can be defined similarly as in [19]

$$\omega_{dark}^{eff} = -1 + \frac{1}{3}\frac{d\ ln\ \delta H^2(z)}{d\ ln\ (1+z)}\ , \tag{6}$$

where $1+z = a^{-1}$. Here any modification of the standard Hubble parameter H is encapsulated in the term δH^2 (including ρ_Λ^C). One finally obtains

$$\omega_{dark}^{eff} = -1 + \frac{(1+z)^{3-\alpha} - (1+z)^3}{\left(\frac{3}{3-\alpha}\right)(1+z)^{3-\alpha} - (1+z)^3 + \rho_\Lambda^C/\rho_{\nu 0}}\ . \tag{7}$$

From (7) one can infer the law $m_\nu(a)$ by demanding that ω_Λ^{eff} should not change significantly with z. Since $\rho_\Lambda^C/\rho_{\nu 0}$ can be quite large, $\gtrsim 15$, one shows that, for instance, with $d\omega_{dark}^{eff}/dz|_{z=0} \simeq 0.05$, Eq. (7) can even sustain values for α as large as $\gtrsim 1$. However, such large values for α would spoil the tracking behavior at earlier times when the constant term in the denominator of (7) ceased to be dominant, and therefore the only acceptable values are $\alpha \ll 1$. Hence, on cosmological scales, neutrinos show very slow mass variation. Regarding (7), one should not be bothered much by the fact that for $\alpha > 0$, the effective EOS is less than -1, since it is well known that arguments leading to the Big Rip singularity no longer apply to variable CC models [16, 19].

We have seen that although with the *anzatz* (3) our scenario resembles the FNW one in that both share the same equation (4) (connecting dark energy and neutrinos), nonetheless neutrino mass scales quite differently in each scenario. To obtain sizable scaling of $m_\nu(a)$, one has to enlarge the *anzatz* (3) to include the noncanonical scaling of n_ν as well. We therefore write

$$m_\nu(a) = m_{\nu_0} a^\alpha; \qquad n_\nu(a) = n_{\nu_0} a^{-3+\beta}\ , \tag{8}$$

where β is a constant. Although, in this case, (4) no longer applies, one can easily check that the effective EOS is still given by (7), but now with the replacement $\alpha \to \alpha + \beta$. The

requirement that ω_Λ^{eff} should not vary significantly with z is now obeyed if $\alpha+\beta \approx 0$. This has strong implications for the scaling of $m_\nu(a)$. One sees that, practically, any law for $m_\nu(a)$ can be underpinned by (7) if the transfer of energy between the two components is always two-way. For instance, if $\alpha \simeq 3$ (as in the FNW scenario), one needs $\beta \simeq -3$. This means that the CC decays into neutrinos by changing their mass, but simultaneously the neutrino component decays (practically by the same amount) into the CC, thereby changing n_ν from its canonical shape.

Finally, we would like to mention that the variable CC model [12] is completely able to underpin the present scenario. It is a decaying CC model with $\alpha+\beta > 0$. The model is based on the renormalization-group (RG) evolution for ρ_Λ, and on the choice for the RG scale $\mu = H$. It can be shown that a canonical value for $\alpha+\beta$ is $(4\pi)^{-1} \ll 1$. In addition, the CC-variation law, $d\rho_\Lambda/dz \propto dH^2/dz$, is a derivative one, thus having a natural appearance of a nonzero ρ_Λ^C.

We would like to conclude with a few additional comments. It is interesting to note that even for static neutrino masses $\alpha = 0$, the 'coincidence' $\rho_\Lambda \sim \rho_\nu$ is still maintained if $\beta \neq 0$ [simply replace $\alpha \to \beta$ in (5)]. In addition, the energy density of neutrinos scale almost canonically in the present scenario ($\alpha+\beta \approx 0$), in strong contrast with the FNW scenario where the neutrino gas is promoted to an almost undilutable fluid. This is related to a nice feature that ρ_Λ, as a solution of (1), always tracks ρ_ν, even for small $\alpha+\beta$ [cf. (5) with the replacement $\alpha \to \alpha+\beta$]. We are aware that the assumptions (3) and (8) are not the most general ones, but also feel that they certainly cover a large number of interesting cases. We have thus demonstrated how variable CC models may naturally explain the 'coincidence' between dark energy and neutrinos, with both neutrino mass changing with the expansion of the universe and without such changing. Both slow and quick neutrino mass changing can be naturally implemented in our model.

Acknowledgments. The author acknowledges the support of the Croatian Ministry of Science and Technology under the contract No. 0098011.

---

[1] P. J. Steinhardt, in "Critical Problems in Physics", edited by V. L. Fitch and Dr. R. Marlow (Princeton University Press, Princeton, N. J., 1997).

[2] R. Fardon, A. E. Nelson and N. Weiner, JCAP 0410 (2004) 005 [astro-ph/0309800].

[3] D. B. Kaplan, A. E. Nelson and N. Weiner, Phys. Rev. Lett. 93 (2004) 091801 [hep-ph/0401099].

[4] R. D. Peccei, Phys. Rev. D71 (2005) 023527 [hep-ph/0411137].

[5] R. R. Caldwell, R. Dave and P. J. Steinhardt, Phys. Rev. Lett. 80 (1999) 1582 [astro-ph/9708069]; B. Ratra and P. J. E. Peebles, Phys. Rev. D37 (1988) 3406; C. Wetterich, Nucl. Phys. B302 (1988) 668.

[6] M. Kawasaki, H. Murayama and T. Yanagida, Mod. Phys. Lett. A7 (1992) 563; G. J. Stephenson, T. Goldman and B. H. J. McKellar, Int. J. Mod. Phys. A13 (1998) 2765 [hep-ph/9603392]; Mod. Phys. Lett. A12 (1997) 2391 [hep-ph/9610317]; R. F. Sawyer, Phys. Lett. B448 (1999) 174 [hep-ph/9809348].

[7] R. Horvat, Mod. Phys. Lett. A14 (1999) 2245 [hep-ph/9904451]; JHEP 0208 (2002) 031 [hep-ph/0007168]; P. Q. Hung, hep-ph/0010126; P. Gu, X. Wang and X. Zhang, Phys. Rev. D68 (2003) 087301 [hep-ph/0307148]; A. Brookfield, C. van de Bruck, D. F. Mota and D. Tocchini-Valentini, astro-ph/0503349.

[8] X. J. Bi, P. H. Gu, X. Wang and X. Zhang, Phys. Rev. D69 (2004) 113007 [hep-ph/0311022]; P. H. Gu and X. J. Bi, Phys. Rev. D70 (2004) 063511.

[9] V. Barger, P. Huber and D. Marfatia, hep-ph/0502196; M. Cirelli and M. C. Gonzales-Garcia, hep-ph/0503028.

[10] P. Q. Hung and H. Pas, astro-ph/0311131.

[11] I. L. Shapiro and J. Sola, Phys. Lett. B475 (2000) 236 [hep-ph/9910462]; JHEP 0202 (2002) 006 [hep-th/0012227]; A. Babic, B. Guberina, R. Horvat, and H. Stefancic, Phys. Rev. D65 (2002) 085002 [hep-ph/0111207]; B. Guberina, R. Horvat, and H. Stefancic, Phys. Rev. D67 (2003) 083001 [hep-ph/0211184]; A. Babic, B. Guberina, R. Horvat, and H. Stefancic, astro-ph/0407572.

[12] I. L. Shapiro, J. Sola, C. Espana-Bonet and P. Ruiz-Lapuente, Phys. Lett. B574 (2003) 149 [astro-ph/0303306]; C. Espana-Bonet, P. Ruiz-Lapuente, I. L. Shapiro and J. Sola, JCAP 0402 (2004) 006 [hep-ph/0311171].

[13] A. Bonnano and M. Reuter, Phys. Rev. D65 (2002) 043508 [hep-th/0106133].

[14] S. H. Hsu, Phys. Lett. B594 (2004) 13 [hep-th/0403052]; R. Horvat, Phys. Rev. D70 (2004) 087301 [astro-ph/0404204]; B. Guberina, R. Horvat, and H. Stefancic, JCAP 05 (2005) 001

[astro-ph/0503495].

[15] J. M. Overduin, F. I. Cooperstock, Phys. Rev. D58 (1998) 043506 [astro-ph/9805260]

[16] P. Wang, X-He. Meng, Class. Quant. Grav. 22 (2005) 283 [astro-ph/0408495].

[17] A. D. Dolgov, S. H. Hansen, S. Pastor, S. T. Petcov, G. Raffelt and D. V. Semikoz, Nucl. Phys. B632 (2002) 363 [hep-ph/0201287].

[18] D. N. Spergel et al., Astrophys. J. Suppl. 148 (2003) 148 [astro-ph/0302209]; M. Tegmark, Phys. Rev. D69 (2004) 103501 [astro-ph/0310723]; U. Seljak et al., astro-ph/0407372; S. Cole, astro-ph/0501174; D. J. Eisenstein, astro-ph/05001171.

[19] E. V. Linder and A. Jenkins, MNRAS 346 (2003) 573 [astro-ph/0305286]; E. V. Linder, Phys. Rev. D70 (2004) 023511 [astro-ph/0402503].

[20] R. R. Caldwell, M. Kamionkowski and N. N. Weinberg, Phys. Rev. Lett. 91 (2003) 071301 [astro-ph/0302506]; E. Elizalde, S. Nojri, S. D. Odintsov and P. Wang, hep-th/0502082.